

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

10 PATRICK FLEETWOOD ET AL,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 WASHINGTON STATE
14 UNIVERSITY,

15 Defendant.

NO. 2:20-CV-00355-SAB

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
REMAND REPLY BRIEF

11/25/2020 6:30 PM

WITHOUT ORAL
ARGUMENT

16
17
18 Despite Defendant's attempt to factually distinguish *Lapides* the legal
19 principal announced in that case remains the same *a la* "the general legal principle
20 requiring waiver ought to apply" unless "there is something special about removal."
21 *Lapides v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. Sys. of Georgia*, 535 U.S. 613, 620 (2002)(citing
22 *Wisconsin Dep.t of Corr. v. Schacht*). *Lapides* found there was nothing inherently
23 "special" about that case's removal - - a removal involving both state tort law claims
24
25

1 as well as a § 1983 claim. *Id.* at 621. By analogy, there is nothing inherently
2 “special” about the removal of this case. Plaintiffs do not dispute Defendant’s
3 ability to remove the case to this Court but only Defendant’s desire to maintain its
4 11th Amendment Immunity to Plaintiff’s claims. And while *Lapides* noted that a
5 §1983 claim may not exist against a State because a State is not a “person” under
6 §1983 it nevertheless held “that removal is a form of voluntary invocation of a
7 federal court's jurisdiction sufficient to waive the State's otherwise valid objection
8 to litigation of a matter (here of state law) in a federal forum.” *Lapides*, 535 U.S. at
9 624. Accordingly, in the event the Court does not remand the case to state court
10 the Court should, at a minimum, rule that Defendant waived its immunity defense
11 to all of Plaintiff’s claims except the § 1983 due process claim. (ECF No. 1-2, p.
12 72, *citing* count 7, § 1983 Due Process)

13
14
15
16 As it relates Plaintiff’s motion to remand the Administrative Procedures Act
17 (APA) claim to state court, Defendant argues that remand is improper under
18 *Younger* because the APA claim is “not ongoing because it was removed to federal
19 court.” (ECF No. 9, pg. 8). Defendant cites *IndyMac Venture, LLC v. Silver Creek*
20 *Crossing, LLC* 2009 WL 3698513 (W.D. Wn. 2009), *Village of Depue, Ill. v. Exxon*
21 *Mobil Corp.*, 537 F.3d 775 (7th Cir. 2008), *Benas v. Shea Mortg. Inc.*, 2011 WL
22 4635645 * 2 (S.D. Cal. 2011), *Nielson v. Armstrong Consultants Inc.*, 2011 WL
23 13228456 * 7 (D. Ariz. 2011) and *Greenwood Park v. Park County*, 2008 WL
24
25

1 11414601 * 1 (D. Montana 2008) in support of the argument that *Younger* does not
2 apply because the APA claim is not ongoing. (ECF No. 9, pg. 8-9) Those cases from
3 2008, 2009, and 2011 do not control because they were decided before the Ninth
4 Circuit’s 2017 *Nationwide Biweekly Admin., Inc. v. Owen* decision which held, for
5 the purpose of *Younger*, that “[s]tate proceedings are ‘ongoing’ if they are initiated
6 ‘before any proceedings of substance on the merits have taken place in the federal
7 court’” - - - which is what happened here. *Nationwide Biweekly Admin., Inc. v.*
8 *Owen*, 873 F.3d 716, 728 (9th Cir. 2017)(citing *Hicks v. Miranda*, 422 U.S. 332,
9 349 (1975)).
10
11

12 Plaintiffs “initiated” the APA claim on March 13, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID
13 103) Plaintiff served Defendant with discovery on April 8, 2020. (ECF No. 5,
14 PGID 188) The state court denied Defendant’s motion to dismiss the APA claim
15 on May 7, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID 190) The state court issued an “Administrative
16 Scheduling Order” regarding the APA claim on May 12, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID
17 192 – 193) Defendant filed a motion to seal certain records relating to the APA
18 claim on June 10, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID 195) The Court granted Defendant’s
19 motion to seal on June 24, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID 201 - 204) Defendant filed the
20 “Agency Record” in the state court on June 30, 2020. (ECF No. 5, PGID 207 – 208)
21 From July 30, 2020 through October 7, 2020 the parties complied with the
22 Administrative Scheduling Order by filing an opening brief, a response brief, and a
23
24
25

1 reply brief. (ECF No. 5, PGID 544 – 577, 708 – 730, 769 - 788 *citing* 7/30/2020
2 Fleetwood’s Opening Brief; 9/21/2020 Defendant’s Response Brief; 10/7/2020
3 Fleetwood’s Reply Brief) Unquestionably, Plaintiff “initiated” and then prosecuted
4 the APA claim months before Defendant removed that claim to this court. By way
5 of comparison, no proceedings of any substance have occurred in this Court.
6

7 Accordingly, since the APA claim was “ongoing” before its removal to this
8 Court and since this Court has not conducted anything of substance on the merits
9 of any of Plaintiff’s claims the Court should remand the APA claim to the Whitman
10 County Superior Court.
11

12 Plaintiff’s motion should be granted.

13 DATED this November 23, 2020.

14
15 *s/ Matt Crotty*

16 Matthew Z. Crotty, WSBA 39284
17 Crotty & Son Law Firm, PLLC
18 905 W. Riverside Ave. Ste. 404
19 Spokane, WA 99201
20 Telephone: 509-850-7011
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to those attorneys of record registered on the CM/ECF system. All other parties, if any, shall be served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated this November 23, 2020

/s Matthew Crotty

MATTHEW Z. CROTTY

Crotty & Son Law Firm, PLLC

905 West Riverside, Suite 404

Spokane, WA 99201

Telephone: 509.850.7011